



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/814,494	03/31/2004	Peter D. Gunn	030048122US	6456
64066	7590	07/21/2008		
PERKINS COIE, LLP			EXAMINER	
P.O. BOX 1247			AMIN, BHAVESH V	
PATENT - SEA				
SEATTLE, WA 98111-1247				
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3664	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/21/2008 PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/814,494

Applicant(s)

GUNN ET AL.

Examiner

BHAVESH AMIN

Art Unit

3664

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03/31/2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 52 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 52 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1 – 6, 8 – 11, 23 – 29, 32 – 33, 38 & 49 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Barnett US Patent 5,416,705.

Regarding claim 1 where it is disclosed by Barnett in column 2 lines 3 – 35 to have a method of allowing their system to accept inputs from an aircraft operator. Further more this input being in alphanumeric form, and this being read upon by applicant's claim to, "receiving an input from an aircraft operator at an aircraft flight deck; comparing a characteristic of the input to at least one target value for the characteristic." It is also disclosed by Barnett to have a system, which can used the inputted information to compare it to a stored value to determine if an action needs to be carried out as is described in column 5 lines 17 – 33. This is read upon by applicant's claim to, "if the characteristic of the input differs from the at least one target value for the characteristic by at least a threshold amount, displaying an assistance message to the aircraft operator, the assistance message including at least one of a complying input and an instruction for creating a complying input."

Regarding claim 2 where it is disclosed by Barnett to have a system that is able to display a message to a display screen in regards to the inputted information, this is

whilst it is showing the information that is being entered by the operator. This is read upon by applicants claim to, "displaying an assistance message includes displaying an assistance message at least proximate to and simultaneously with displaying the input [column 5 lines 17 – 33]."

Regarding claim 3 where in the abstract of Barnett's disclosure it described how the system allows the user to input alpha numeric characters into the system. This read upon by applicant's claim to, "receiving an input includes receiving an input that includes alphanumeric characters."

Regarding claim 4 where it is described by Barnett to have their system change the values depending on the reference value they have in the system and what the user has entered into the alphanumeric keypad. This is read upon by applicant's claim to, "activating the input if the characteristic of the input does not differ from the at least one target value, or differs from the at least one target value by less than the threshold amount. [Column 5 lines 17 – 33]."

Regarding claim 5 where it is disclosed by Barnett to have their system be capable of carrying out the step of presenting the entered values from the alphanumeric keypad to the screen as described in column 5 lines 17 – 33. This is read upon by applicant's claim to, "presenting the input at an active display field if the characteristic of the input does not differ from the at least one target value, or if the characteristic of the input differs from the at least one target value by less than the threshold amount."

Regarding claim 6 where it is disclosed by Barnett to have a system that is able to carry out the steps of figuring out how much the change of the value is from the

entered values into the system to the current settings and displaying this on a screen, as described in column 5 lines 17 – 33. This is read upon by applicant's claim to, "comprising activating the input if the characteristic of the input does not differ from the at least one target value, or if the characteristic of the input differs from the at least one target value by less than the threshold amount, and wherein activating the input includes directing a change in a characteristic of the aircraft."

Regarding claim 8 where it is disclosed by Barnett in column 5 lines 17 – 33 to have the system compare what is entered to what is already being displayed on the screen for the aircraft settings. This is read upon by applicant's claim to, "comparing a characteristic includes comparing a format of the input to a target format."

Regarding claim 9 where it is disclosed by Barnett, in column 5 lines 17 – 33, to have their system compare the values entered into the keypad to values set in a database and thus is read upon by applicant's claim to, "comparing a characteristic includes comparing a number of characters in a character string to a target number of characters."

Regarding claim 10 where it is described by Barnett to have their system "compare" the already entered character with the new one being entered from a database as is described in column 5 lines 17 - 33. This is read upon by applicant's claim to, "comparing a characteristic includes comparing a type of character in a character string to a target type of character."

Regarding claim 11 where it is described by Barnett to have their system "compare" the value that is entered into the system to the value that is already in the

system, as described in column 5 lines 17 – 33. This is read upon by applicant's claim to, "comparing a characteristic includes comparing a numerical value to a target numerical value."

Regarding claim 13 where when the user entered some data incorrectly it displays and error message as is described in column 5 lines 17 - 33. This is read upon by applicant's claim to, "comprising displaying the same assistance message for all non-complying inputs provided to fulfill data requests of a predetermined type."

Regarding claim 23 where it is described by Barnett to have their system display messages on the aircraft multifunctional display as shown in Fig 1. This is read upon by applicant's claim to, "displaying the assistance message includes displaying the assistance message at a multi-function display of the aircraft flight deck."

Regarding claim 24, this has the same limitations as that of claims 1 & 4 and is therefore rejected for the same reasons as stated for claims 1 & 4 above.

Regarding claim 25 where in Figure 6 of Barnett's disclosure it describes how the system activates a field in which data is being entered and thus is read upon by applicant's claim to, "activating the input includes presenting the input at an active display field."

Regarding claim 26, this has the same limitations as that of claim 8 and is therefore rejected for the same reasons as stated for claim 8 above.

Regarding claim 27, this has the same limitations as that of claim 9 and is therefore rejected for the same reasons as stated for claim 9 above.

Regarding claim 28, this has the same limitations as that of claim 10 and is therefore rejected for the same reasons as stated for claim 10 above.

Regarding claim 29, this has the same limitations as that of claim 11 and is therefore rejected for the same reasons as stated for claim 11 above.

Regarding claim 32 where it is described by Barnett to have their system display messages on the aircraft multifunctional display as shown in Fig 1. This is read upon by applicant's claim to, "displaying the assistance message includes displaying the assistance message at a multi-function display of the aircraft flight deck."

Regarding claim 33 which is the system for the corresponding method claim of claim 1 & 24 and is therefore rejected for the same reasons as stated for claim 1 & 24 above.

Regarding claim 38 which is the corresponding computer method claim for method claims 1 & 24 and is therefore rejected for the same reasons as stated for claims 1 & 24 above.

Regarding claim 49 which is the system for the corresponding method claim of claim 1 & 24 and is therefore rejected for the same reasons as stated for claim 1 & 24 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 12 & 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barnett.

Regarding claim 12 where it all the limitations of claim 1 are disclosed by Barnett who does not specifically disclose the further limitation of, "displaying a message includes displaying a plurality of sample complying inputs." However Barnett does disclose displaying values entered by the user. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of invention to modify Barnett with the known art of displaying how one should enter data into the system, as this would have yield predictable results and would not required undue experimentation. (Please see MPEP 2143).

Regarding claim 30, this has the same limitations as that of claim 12 and is therefore rejected for the same reasons as stated for claim 12 above.

5. Claim 7, 16 - 18 & 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barnett and further in view of Middleton et al. US Patent 5,499,025 (hereafter referenced as Middleton).

Regarding claim 7 where all the limitations of claim 1 are disclosed by Barnett who does not specifically disclose the further limitation of, "comprising activating the input if the characteristic of the input does not differ from the at least one target value, or if the characteristic of the input differs from the at least one target value by less than the threshold amount, and wherein activating the input includes directing a change in at least one of a speed, altitude and flight path of the aircraft."

This is disclosed by Middleton where they describe how their system is capable of allowing the operator to input changes to the parameters of the aircrafts flight. This is indicated as follows: "comprising activating the input if the characteristic of the input does not differ from the at least one target value, or if the characteristic of the input differs from the at least one target value by less than the threshold amount, and wherein activating the input includes directing a change in at least one of a speed, altitude and flight path of the aircraft. [Column 12 lines 22 – 67 and shown in Figs 8C-D & 9A-C]."

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of invention to modify Barnett by the teachings of Middleton to enable the system to warn the pilot of entering data incorrectly such as typographical errors for safety reasons. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take two well known techniques with out undue experimentation and have predictable results. (Please see MPEP 2143).

Regarding claim 16 where all the limitations of claim 1 are disclosed by Barnett who does not specifically disclose the further limitation of, "displaying an assistance message includes displaying multiple criteria associated with a complying input."

This is disclosed by Middleton in Figs 7A-E, 8A-B, 9A-D, 10A-B & 11, where it can be seen that the system is able to display a message in regards to what data has been entered. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of invention to modify Barnett by the known teachings of Middleton to produce predictable results without undue experimentation. (Please see MPEP 2143).

Regarding claim 17 where all the limitations of claim 1 are disclosed by Barnett who does not specifically disclose the further limitation of, "displaying an assistance message includes displaying an indication of a single criterion associated with a complying input when the input received at the aircraft flight deck fails to comply with the single criterion."

This is shown by Middleton in Figs 7 – 11 where it can be seen that the system will issue warns when the entered information is incorrect. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of invention to modify Barnett by the known teachings of Middleton to allow the system to display warns when data is entered incorrectly and thus prevent an accident. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the teachings of Middleton without undue experimentation and predictable results. (Please see MPEP 2143).

Regarding claim 18 where all the limitations of claim 1 are disclosed by Barnett who does not specifically disclose the further limitation of, "displaying the assistance message includes displaying at least one of a number of characters for a complying input, at least one alphabetic character for a complying input, and at least one numerical character for a complying input." This is rejected for the same reasons as stated for claim 17 above.

Regarding claim 21 where all the limitations of claim 1 are disclosed by Barnett who does not specifically disclose the further limitation of, "displaying the input at a first location of the aircraft flight deck; and displaying the assistance message at a second

location of the aircraft flight deck, the second location being at least proximate to the first location.”

This is disclosed by Middleton in Fig 1 where it can be seen that the system can display multiple items on one screen. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of invention to modify Barnett by the teachings of Middleton to allow the system to display multiple items on one screen as was well known in the art at the time of invention. The combination of Barnett and Middleton would have yield predictable results with out undue experimentation. (Please see MPEP 2143).

6. Claim 14 & 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barnett in further view of Brame US Patent 4,224,669.

Regarding claim 14 where all the limitations of claim 1 are disclosed by Barnett who does not specifically disclose the further limitation of, “comprising displaying a first assistance message for all non-complying inputs provided to fulfill data requests of a first type; and displaying a second assistance message different than the first assistance message for non-complying inputs provided to fulfill data requests of a second type different than the first type.”

This is disclosed by Brame as described in columns 2 & 3 lines 55 – 68 & 1 – 54 respectively. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of invention to modify Barnett by the teachings of Brame to ensure the safety of passengers and crew by stopping typographical errors.

Regarding claim 15 where all the limitations of claim 15 are disclosed by Barnett who does not specifically disclose the further limitation of, “providing a first assistance

message if the input fails to comply with the target characteristic on a first basis; and providing a second assistance message different than the first assistance message if the input fails to comply with the target characteristic on a second basis different than the first basis.”

This is disclosed by Brame as described in columns 2 & 3 lines 55 – 68 & 1 – 54 respectively. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of invention to modify Barnett by the teachings of Brame to ensure the safety of passengers and crew by stopping/preventing typographical errors.

7. Claims 19, 20, 22 & 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barnett and further in view of Oder et al. US Patent 5,475,594 (hereafter referenced as Oder).

Regarding claim 19 where all the limitations of claim 1 are disclosed by Barnett who does not specifically disclose the further limitation of, “wherein a complying input includes a data element and a modifier, and wherein displaying the assistance message includes indicating the position of the modifier relative to the data element for a complying input.”

This is disclosed by Oder in column 12 lines 6 – 33 where it can be seen that they describe how the entered value will affect the aircraft. In this case how not finishing a current check list will indicate a warning to instruct then to finish it. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of invention to use Barnett's aircraft multifunctional display system with Oder's system ability to warn pilots that they

have an error, would have resulted in predictable results and would not have required undue experimentation. (Please see MPEP 2143).

Regarding claim 20 where all the limitations of claim 1 are disclosed by Barnett who does not specifically disclose the further limitation of, "receiving a request for a change in a characteristic of the assistance message; and changing the characteristic of the assistance message."

This is disclosed by Oder where in column 12 lines 6 – 33 it discloses how the system would warn the operator that they have not completed a check in the aircraft system and thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of invention to modify Barnett by the teachings of Oder to allow a built in safe guard to prevent an accident by the operator due to an typographical error. The combination of the known methods of Barnett and Oder would yield predictable results and would not require undue experimentation. (Please see MPEP 2143).

Regarding claim 22 where all the limitations of claim 1 are disclosed by Barnett who does not specifically disclose the further limitation of, "the input includes a first input, and wherein the method further comprises: receiving a second input, the second input being a complying input; and ceasing to display the assistance message after receiving the second input."

This is disclosed by Oder who in column 12 lines 6 – 33 discloses how their system is able to stop showing the warning message once the operator has fulfilled the requirements of that particular message. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of invention to modify Barnett by the teachings of Oder to

incorporate the known teachings of removing a message from the screen once the criteria has been fulfilled as shown by Oder, incorporated with Barnett to yield predictable result with out undue experimentation. (Please see MPEP 2143).

Regarding claim 31 where all the limitations of claim 24 are disclosed by Barnett who does not specifically disclose the further limitation of, "the input includes a first input, and wherein the method further comprises: receiving a second input, the second input being a complying input; and ceasing to display the assistance message after receiving the second input."

This is disclosed by Oder who in column 12 lines 6 – 33 discloses how their system is able to stop showing the warning message once the operator has fulfilled the requirements of that particular message. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of invention to modify Barnett by the teachings of Oder to incorporate the known teachings of removing a message from the screen once the criteria has been fulfilled as shown by Oder, incorporated with Barnett to yield predictable result with out undue experimentation. (Please see MPEP 2143).

Regarding claims 34 – 37 which are the system claims for corresponding method claims and are therefore rejected fro the same reasons as stated for their corresponding method claims.

Regarding claims 39 – 48 this is the corresponding computer program method steps for the method step above and are therefore rejected for the same reasons as stated above.

Regarding claims 50 – 52 which are the corresponding apparatus for methods claims stated above and are therefore rejected for the same reasons as stated above.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Griffin, III et al. US Patent 5,916,297 – improved flight management system.
9. Coquin US Patent 5,798,712 – aircraft warning system
10. Orton US Patent 6,897,790 B2 – Aircraft flight security system
11. Tran US Patent 5,508,928 – Aircraft survivability system state management
12. Tringleff et al. US Patent 4,424,038 – Inflight aircraft training system

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BHAVESH AMIN whose telephone number is (571)270-3255. The examiner can normally be reached on M - T, Friday off, 7:30am to 6:00pm, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Khoi Tran can be reached on 571-272-6919. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you

Art Unit: 3664

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/B. A./

Examiner, Art Unit 3664 (07/16/02008)

/Khoi H Tran/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3664